1	time it was incorporated, if you recall.
2	A In 1998? Or, are you talking
3	about in 1999 prior to the auction?
4	Q Well, either one. Let's start
5	with 1998. At the time of its incorporation,
6	what was the general ownership structure?
7	A In 1998, the only owner was
8	myself, 800,000 shares.
9	Q Okay. And this is even though
10	there were other individuals that participated
11	in the formation of PCSI?
12	A Yes. Like yes.
13	Q Okay. That's in 1998. Did you
14	mention the number of shares that were issued
15	at that point?
16	A 800,000.
17	Q At the time of its incorporation?
18	A I'd have to go back yes, I'd
19	have to go back and take a look at how how
20	we did it, but that generally, that was,
21	you know, that was
22	Q Yes, just to the best of your

1	recollection.
2	A Yes.
3	Q I know it was a while ago. Okay.
4	And then in 1999 what was it?
5	A Well, in 1999 we had sold Series A
6	preferred stock, so there was investors like
7	Chandu Patel and others who had purchases
8	Series A preferred.
9	And in 1998, a number of common
10	stock was issued to by agreement with Jerry
11	Setka. I believe he didn't actually receive
12	the stock until 1999, but the agreement was in
13	1998.
14	So, at that point I believe and
15	then there was a number of individuals that
16	held common shares, it's a handful, in 1999.
17	Q 1999?
18	A Yes.
19	Q Okay. But in 1998 you issued
20	addition shares in addition to the 800,000 you
21	have just told us about, or they had not been
22	issued at that point?

1	A No, in '98 yes, you're correct.
2	It was not issued till '99.
3	Q All right. So, in 1998, you were
4	the only shareholder?
5	A I'd have to go back and look at
6	the records.
7	Q All right. To the best of your
8	recollection.
9	A To the best of my recollection,
10	but the documents that we submitted will have
11	that in detail.
12	Q In 1999, you've indicated that
13	additional shares were issued or were
14	A That is correct.
15	Q Okay. Can you give us the top
16	three or four shareholders at that point?
17	A Myself, Jerry Setka, and on the
18	preferred Series A preferred stock, it
19	would have been Chandu Patel.
20	Q Can you give us approximately what
21	the ownership interests were for each of you,
22	each of the three?

1	A Okay. Can you be more specific,
2	because now we're getting into the area of
3	economic interest versus voting stock in the
4	company. And I know we've submitted this to
5	you several times, and I could do the math
6	pretty quick.
7	Q Can you give us both of those? In
8	other words
9	A Okay.
10	Q to the best of your knowledge
11	of those interests.
12	A Voting I would have been around
13	78 percent. Jerry Setka would have been
14	around 14 percent. And then the other
15	individuals would have made up the difference.
16	Economic interest would have been
17	diluted based on how many shares of preferred
18	stock that was sold, I believe, was 200 and
19	some-odd thousand, so that would have diluted
20	the economic interest down maybe by ten
21	percent, 15 percent.
22	Q So, in other words, you would

1	still have had your 800,000 shares and I'm
2	just I'm paraphrasing what you told us, and
3	tell me if I'm incorrect.
4	And then you had issued an
5	additional 200,000, is that correct, in '99?
6	A Of common?
7	Q Whatever. Diluting what we
8	were talking about right now is the economic
9	interest, right? So, in terms of economic
LO	ownership interest, you had your original
11	800,000
12	A Yes.
13	Q in '98. '99 you issued an
L4	additional 200,000, and correct me if I'm
L5	misstating it. And that additional 200,000
L6	diluted your ownership, your economic
L7	ownership interest, is that what you've
1.8	testified?
19	A I think you missed one.
20	Q Okay.
21	A 800,000 and there was 190,000 that
22	went of common that went to Jerry Setka

1	that represented his percentages that I just
2	gave you.
3	Q Okay.
4	A I mean, approximate. And then in
5	1999 we issued Series A preferred stock which
6	has a different voting right than common, but
7	it factors into the economic interest based on
8	its conversion.
9	Q Okay. So the percentages you were
LO	giving me where you said you had 78 percent,
L1	Setka had 14 percent, and the other
L2	individuals had the remaining percentage,
L3	that's the voting interest or the economic
L4	interest?
L5	A Combining all the when you
L6	bring in the preferred the preferred
L7	shares, you're talking about the economic
L8	interest.
L9	Q Right.
20	A The preferred stock does not have
21	voting rights.
22	Q Okay.

1	A So, the common is your vote, which
2	is the first set of numbers, and then when you
3	add in the preferred it dilutes the economic
4	interest but not the voting interest.
5	Q Okay. All right. Let's move on
б	to 2000. In 2000, did PCSI participate in the
7	FCC auction?
8	A Yes, it did.
9	Q Okay. And what steps did PCSI
10	make to participate in the auction?
11	A Could you be more specific?
12	Q How did the company arrange to
13	participate in the auction? Did you have
14	individuals make filings for you? If so, who?
15	Did you require additional funds and if so,
16	where did you get those funds? Those kind of
17	arrangements, that's what I'm talking about.
18	Well, maybe it's easier if we do
19	it this way: Did PCSI participate in an FCC
20	auction in the year 2000?
21	A Yes. Yes, we did.
22	Q Okay. Do you remember the auction

1 \	number?	
2	A 34.	
3	Q Okay. And as a result of	its
4	participation, did it win some licenses?	
5	A Yes, it did.	
6	Q Okay. Can you tell us how n	nany
7	licenses it won?	
8	A 38. I'd have to I'd have to	o
9	the number 38 comes to mind, but	
10	Q Okay.	
11	A I'd have to look at	the
12	numbers.	
13	Q And those are economic a	area
14	licenses?	
15	A That is correct.	
16	Q Okay. Now, in order	to
17	participate in that auction, was ther	e a
18	downpayment required by the FCC?	
19	A Let me back up. Yes, there wa	ıs a
20	downpayment that was required.	
21	Q Okay.	
22	A Five percent bear with m	e a

1	minute. It's been a while. There is there
2	is initial payment to the FCC that set your
3	qualifications to participate in the auction,
4	which we arranged with Chandu Patel, like
5	\$1.325 million that set the, you know, how
6	many licenses that we could bid on. It set
7	our eligibility requirement in the auction.
8	Q And was that \$1.325 in addition to
9	the money that he'd already invested?
LO	A That is correct.
L1	Q And what form did that money come
L2	in from him?
L3	A It was a loan to PAI.
1.4	Q Okay. And I'm sorry. Go
L5	ahead. Finish. Or, are you finished with
L6	your answer?
L7	A Yes.
18	Q Okay. Can you tell us what PAI
L9	is, for the record.
20	A Yes. Preferred Acquisitions,
21	Inc., you know, is a subsidiary of Preferred,
22	which we formed to specifically to participate

1	in this auction.
2	Q Okay. And when you say "we," who
3	is "we"?
4	A The company, PCSI.
5	Q All right. And at that point in
6	2000, who did the company consist of?
7	A At the time in 2000 the we just
8	went through the ownership, but there's a
9	number of different owners. Jerry Setka and
10	myself are the two largest common shareholders
11	and voteholders in the company.
12	And Michelle and I were the two
13	directors of the company, or two officers. I
14	was the sole director. That's when I speak
15	of the "we," I speak of the collective, we,
16	the company.
17	Q So, in other words, Jerry Setka,
18	yourself and Michelle Bishop. What about
19	Jerry Bishop? Oh, I'm sorry. Excuse me. Jay
20	Bishop.
21	A Jay Bishop at the time was a
22	consultant to Preferred.

1	Q	Okay.
2	A	And his
3	Q	Okay.
4	A	He did not own any stock, whether
5	it was pre	ferred or common.
6	Q	Okay. Was the loan from Chandu
7	Patel evid	enced by some document and if so,
8	what docum	ent?
9	A	I'm sorry. Can you repeat that.
10	Q	Did Chandu Patel receive some
11	ownership	interest that was represented in
12	writing in	any form as a result of
13	A	No.
14	Q	his No, he did not?
15	A	No.
16	Q	Is there some reason why not?
17	A	It was he loaned money to
18	Preferred	or, excuse me, to PAI. It was
19	not a stoc	k transaction.
20	Q	And did not ask for any kind of
21	security o	r note in return?
22	A	I'd have to go back and take a

look, and I can certainly supplement it. 1 while since I've looked at 2 been a the 3 document, but the -- there was a series of 4 transactions with Chandu Patel. The first one was done with ADS 5 6 which is a partnership of Partners, 7 children, Apurva, Divya and Sonal who owned the \$1.325 million. And with that it was a 8 9 loan along with a pledge agreement, stock 10 pledge agreement. the conclusion of11 And at the the 12 20 auction with making percent --13

And at the conclusion of the auction with -- making the 20 percent downpayment. There was another \$5,032,000 that was a loan, I believe from Chandu Patel, although I have to go and take a look. It may have been ADS Partners. I get confused with that transaction.

And there was a corporate guarantee on that loan, and then the final payment was 24 million and change that was done in three separate wires, I believe, and--

Q I'm sorry. Tell me that amount

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1 | again.

A 24 million and change that -- I'd have to look at the numbers. So, Chandu had -- there was three loan agreements. The first one was ADS Partners with and pledge agreement, and then the other two were subject to a corporate guarantee.

Q Okay. Can you tell us what the pledge agreement consisted of?

A Can you be specific what you --

Q In other words, what form -- or, describe to us what that pledge agreement consisted of.

A The parent company was Preferred, which owned a hundred percent of the stock and PAI was pledging that as -- and putting them in a secured creditor position and then in the event of a default on the loan, they had a right to call in the note and if it wasn't paid, then he had the ability to go after the -- basically the stock, a hundred percent of the stock of PAI was pledged.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Τ (Q Okay. And I I'm sorry, finish
2	your answer.
3	A You know, it was the pledge
4	agreement, it was backing up and securing the
5	note.
6	Q Okay. And where is that
7	agreement? Is there a copy of that agreement?
8	A There are several copies of that
9	agreement.
10	Q Do you have available to you a
11	copy of the agreement?
12	A Yes.
13	Q Did you review it in preparation
14	for the deposition? I'm not trying to confuse
15	you. I'm just
16	A No, I did not, but I have read it
17	many times and
18	Q Do we have that?
19	MS. SINGH: Did you attach a copy
20	of that to your auction filings at all?
21	THE WITNESS: What auction filings
22	are you

1	MS. SINGH: Auction 34 filings.
2	THE WITNESS: Oh, yes. Yes, it's
3	part of that and it also should be a part of
4	discovery, documents that you guys requested.
5	BY MR. OSHINSKY:
6	Q Okay. If it turns out that it's
7	not, I would ask you to do the same thing I
8	asked you about in regard to the business
9	plan.
10	A Yes.
11	Q Simply supply it to your attorney
12	so that he can give it to us.
13	A Right.
14	Q There were very voluminous numbers
15	of documents produced and, you know, clearly,
16	there can be anything could be lost in the
17	amount of documents.
18	A Right.
19	Q So, we're simply asking that you,
20	you know, get a copy of that to your attorney
21	and then he can supply that to us.
22	So there was the pledge agreement.

1	Then you indicated and that was for the
2	1.325 million, and then there was the
3	additional 5 million from Chandu, and you said
4	that was a corporate guarantee.
5	Could you describe that corporate
6	guarantee for us.
7	A Gosh, I don't know how to describe
8	that. The corporation was guaranteeing
9	payment of the note, so they had a standard,
10	you know, guarantee letter.
11	Q And there was a note evidencing
12	this the payment of 5 million from Chandu
13	Patel?
14	A I'm sorry. Repeat that.
15	Q Was there a note produced that
16	Chandu
17	A Yes, there is there's three
18	separate notes.
19	Q Okay.
20	A As I said earlier, there's the
21	1.325, there is a promissory note for the
22	5,032,000.

1	Q Okay.
2	A The pledge agreement went with the
3	first one.
4	Q Right.
5	A Corporate guarantee with the
6	second.
7	Q Right.
8	A And also attached to the third.
9	Q That's also corporate guarantee.
10	A Yes.
11	MR. OSHINSKY: Go off the record
12	for just a second.
13	(Whereupon, the above-entitled
14	matter went off the record at 10:06 a.m. and
15	resumed at 10:18 a.m.)
16	MR. OSHINSKY: We'll go back on
17	the record.
18	BY MR. OSHINSKY:
19	Q Okay. I want to remind you that
20	you're still under oath and other than being
21	tired, as you told me
22	A Veg

1	Q from flying in, you're still
2	able to answer my questions truthfully and
3	correctly, to the best of your knowledge?
4	A That is correct.
5	Q Okay. I'd like to just go back a
6	little bit for a second and make sure that
7	we're clear about the ownership structure in
8	2000, of the company in 2000, at the point
9	where PCSI or PAI, the subsidiary, entered
10	into the Auction 34.
11	Okay. Let me ask you: Who did
12	the filings for to enter into the auction?
13	A Michelle Bishop and with the
14	assistance of David Kaufman, our FCC counsel.
15	Q Okay.
16	A And myself, but Michelle did all
17	the leg work in preparing the documents.
18	Q And was it Michelle or David
19	Kaufman who did the actual filing?
20	A Let's be specific here. Are you
21	talking about who who signed the document
22	or who submitted it to the FCC?

1	Q Okay. Who signed the document?
2	A I'd have to get I know, it
3	give me a minute and let me see if I can
4	recall. I would say that Michelle submitted
5	it.
6	Q And what does
7	A I'm pretty sure about that. At
8	the time you know, sometimes we would have
9	the attorneys submit things on behalf of us
10	and sometimes we would do it ourselves, and I
11	believe that I think Michelle submitted the
12	documents electronically to the FCC.
13	Q Electronically, is that right
14	A I believe let me see, this is
15	2000 back in '98 it was sketchy in terms of
16	what you could file electronically, but by
17	2000 and the software to enter the auction
18	was, I think, considerably different than in
19	auction yes. So, yes, I believe she
20	submitted it electronically.
21	Q Okay. And that would be the Form

175?

22

1	A The Form 175. That's correct.
2	Q Okay. And did you participate in
3	filling out the form?
4	A Very little, other than the I
5	was on the phone with her, with David, and
6	with Michelle to make sure that all the
7	information was correct and I was confident
8	that we had, you know, filled everything out
9	correctly and submitted it.
10	Q Okay. And at that point when the
11	175 was submitted, can you tell us what the
12	ownership structure was at that point, both
13	economic interest and voting interest?
14	A It would be the same numbers that
15	I gave you just before the break. They had
16	not I mean, I could be real specific if you
17	allow me to look at the documents that we've
18	provided you in the past, I could be
19	Q That's fine. If you would just
20	let me know which document. Or do you mean
21	you need additional time for that?
22	A I would I mean, if you want in

1	the record what the exact ownership is
2	Q Well, I'll tell you what: Why
3	don't you supply that after the next break,
4	but can you tell me now? You gave me a fairly
5	detailed recitation of the ownership
6	A Right. Well, you had the
7	Q Could you tell me whether first
8	of all, you can tell me did it change at the
9	point where you submitted the 175? Was the
10	ownership interest different, both economic
11	and voting? Were they different in any way?
12	A From what
13	Q Than what you described in '99.
14	Or, if it's easier, just tell me what they
15	were in 2000.
16	A I don't carry that knowledge in my
17	head.
18	Q Okay. Can you tell
19	A I mean, to me, that to be that
20	specific.
21	Q You can give me approximately what
22	it was.

1	A I'd have to go back and see what
2	what preferred stock we sold at the in '99
3	and in 2000, and Chandu it wasn't
4	significantly different than what I shared
5	with you earlier in terms of voting.
6	I mean, you've had Jerry Setka
7	you have myself, Jerry Setka. You had a
8	number of individuals that own a handful of
9	common shares representing a pretty small
10	percentage, and then you have the preferred
11	stockholders.
12	Q We could actually ask the court
13	reporter to read back just what you told us
14	about 1999.
15	If you could find it. The
16	ownership interest of the corporation in 1999.
17	And if you are going to tell me it's just the
18	same as what he tells us there, then that's
19	fine, too.
20	A Well, at the same time, I don't
21	want to
22	Q Okay. Well, let's

1	A You know, I don't want to
2	MR. OSHINSKY: Are you looking?
3	We can go off the record for a minute while
4	you do that.
5	(Whereupon, the record was read
6	back by the reporter as above-recorded.)
7	MR. OSHINSKY: We're going back on
8	the record, and we have listened to Mr.
9	Austin's prior testimony about the ownership
1.0	interest and now you know.
11	BY MR. OSHINSKY:
12	Q Now, my question do you need me
13	to repeat it or can you just go ahead and
14	answer?
15	A What was the I believe the
16	question was
17	Q The question is: What are the
1.8	economic and voting interest in 2000, just
L9	prior or at the time where PAI,
20	A Yes.
21	Q the subsidiary participates in
22	the

1	A Yes. The my voting stock was
2	77.78 percent, roughly 78 percent of the
3	voting stock and 50 roughly 55 percent of
4	the total equity. That's 54.97.
5	Jerry Setka I was a little off
6	on the numbers earlier. His voting was 19.9
7	and his equity was 14. I had him voting at 14
8	percent. It was 19.
9	And EMED Pharmaceutical had 14
10	percent of the total equity. It's all
11	nonvoting preferred stock. And then there's
12	I mean, those are the major pieces.
13	There's small little pieces, but
14	Q Okay. And just so we don't have
15	to go through this ad nauseam, as the years
16	are going forward, can you tell us how the
17	ownership interest changed, if they did?
18	A Well, yes. It would change when
19	we would sell stock in the company. The
20	now, the equity piece would change, but the
21	vote the vote stayed the same for a very
22	long very long period of time.

1	Q Till when, approximately?
2	A In 2000 it stayed pretty
3	consistent. We haven't I'm just trying to
4	think of the common and, you know, we sold
5	some additional preferred shares that it
6	diluted it, and that would have been in 2005.
7	The equity would have changed a little bit in
8	2005.
9	Q Equity or I thought are you
LO	talking about voting or equity in 2005?
L1	A Yes, I'm saying the vote hasn't
L2	changed
L3	Q Because of
L4	A Yes, and that is you know
L5	Q And so are the percentages that
L6	you gave us true for today as well, currently?
L7	A Well, we have we've submitted
L8	what what the percentages are today or at
L9	the point of the the last time you asked,
20	whenever that was.
31.	Q Can you give them to us as you
22	understand currently? And I understand it may